

TABLE OF CONTENTS

I.	BACKGROUND INFORMATION	1
II.	DESCRIPTION OF PROJECT AND ENVIRONMENTAL SETTING.....	2
III.	PROJECT CONSISTENCY WITH OTHER APPLICABLE LOCAL AND STATE PLANS AND MANDATED LAWS	8
IV.	ENVIRONMENTAL FACTORS POTENTIALLY AFFECTED AND DETERMINATION	9
V.	EVALUATION OF ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS.....	11
VI.	ENVIRONMENTAL CHECKLIST.....	13
	1. AESTHETICS	13
	2. AGRICULTURAL RESOURCES.....	14
	3. AIR QUALITY	14
	4. BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES	16
	5. CULTURAL RESOURCES.....	24
	6. GEOLOGY AND SOILS	28
	7. HAZARDS AND HAZARDOUS MATERIALS	33
	8. HYDROLOGY AND WATER QUALITY	34
	9. LAND USE AND PLANNING.....	36
	10. MINERAL RESOURCES	37
	11. NOISE	37
	12. POPULATION AND HOUSING.....	39
	13. PUBLIC SERVICES.....	40
	14. RECREATION	41
	15. TRANSPORTATION/TRAFFIC.....	42
	16. UTILITIES AND SERVICE SYSTEMS.....	43
VII.	MANDATORY FINDINGS OF SIGNIFICANCE	44
VIII.	REFERENCES	51

FIGURES

FIGURE 1 PROJECT LOCATION AND SITE VICINITY MAP.....	3
FIGURE 2 SITE PLAN.....	4
FIGURE 3 EROSION RATING MAP.....	27
FIGURE 4 30% SLOPE MAP	28

APPENDICES

APPENDIX A BIOLOGICAL ASSESSMENT, JULY 9, 2003	
APPENDIX B FOREST MANAGEMENT ASSESSMENT PLAN, JUNE 26, 2003	
APPENDIX C CULTURAL RESOURCES RECONNAISSANCE, OCTOBER 15, 1988	
APPENDIX D LETTER DATED JANUARY 24, 2003 FROM ARCHAEOLOGICAL CONSULTING	
APPENDIX E GEOLOGICAL AND GEOTECHNICAL REPORT, MAY 14, 2003	
APPENDIX F GEOLOGIC FEASIBILITY INVESTIGATION, NOVEMBER 1988	
APPENDIX G EROSION CONTROL PLAN, JUNE 30, 2003	
APPENDIX H VICTORINE RANCH SUBDIVISION INITIAL STUDY AND NEGATIVE DECLARATION, JUNE 21, 1995	
APPENDIX I BOTANICAL/BIOLOGICAL REPORT, AUGUST 17, 1988	
APPENDIX J CRAVEN-NATION DISPOSITION PLAN, MARCH 2000	

DRAFT INITIAL STUDY/ MITIGATED NEGATIVE DECLARATION

I. BACKGROUND INFORMATION

Project Title:	Victorine Ranch Road Repair
Monterey County File Number:	PLN020562
Project Location:	East of State Highway One and bordered on the south by Garapata State Park, approximately nine miles south of the City of Carmel.
Name of Property Owner:	State of California
Name of Applicant:	State Coastal Conservancy
Assessor's Parcel Numbers:	243-221-018; 243-221-019; 243-221-027
Acreage of Properties:	0.014 acres/120 linear feet
General Plan Designations:	Watershed and Scenic Conservation - Coastal
Zoning Districts:	WSC/40D (CZ): Watershed and Scenic Conservation/40 acres per unit Design Control
Lead Agency:	State of California
Prepared By:	Denise Duffy & Associates, Inc.
Date Prepared:	August 5, 2004
Contact Person:	Josh Harwayne/Paola Horvath
Phone Number:	(831) 373-4341
Electronic Mail:	jharwayne@ddaplaning.com / phorvath@ddaplaning.com

II. DESCRIPTION OF PROJECT AND ENVIRONMENTAL SETTING

A. Project Description:

The project will consist of replacing a 120 linear foot portion of the existing State Coastal Conservancy access road that was washed out in the 1997-98 winter storms events. Prior to the storm damage, the road provided access to the Coastal Conservancy property. The purpose of the road repair is to maintain the Coastal Conservancy's continued access to its property. The road will be restored to its pre-storm condition with no expansion of use.

The project Area of Potential Impact (API) is defined as the limit of grading. Currently the washed out area lacks vegetation or is dominated by non-native species, is severely channelized (approximately six feet deep), and is continuing to erode during storm events. A 36-inch culvert will be placed under the road to facilitate future storm flow. Approximately 336 cubic yards of cut and 267 cubic yards of fill will be required to construct a new drainage crossing. The proposed alignment of the road will be changed slightly. This change will slightly shorten and stabilize the extreme curve that existed prior to the storm damage.

This Initial Study (IS) focuses on the impacts from the road repair project as defined above as located within the API defined on Figures 1 and 2. This document also discusses reasonably foreseeable development which could occur on the Craven-Nation property, outside of the API of the road repair. The Coastal Conservancy may in the future sell the Craven-Nation property, and future development may occur as described in Section VII of this IS. Future uses will be subject to easements reserved in favor of the Coastal Conservancy, upon sale, providing for public access and conservation of environmentally sensitive resource areas, particularly ESHA and Critical Viewshed, under provisions of a Property Disposition Plan adopted by the State Coastal Conservancy as further discussed below, under Project History. Refer to Section VII of this IS for an impact discussion of potential foreseeable actions that may occur on the Coastal Conservancy property.¹

B. Project Objective:

The purpose of the road repair is to repair the road in order to maintain the Coastal Conservancy's continued access to its property. The property access needs to be maintained to provide a reliable road to the existing vacant property owned by the Conservancy located along the roadway, as well as to allow access in order to manage and protect the property's existing natural resources, to assist in any future resource restoration or trail development on the property, and to more effectively market the property for sale.

¹ Section VII further references an adopted Negative Declaration and findings of no substantial evidence that development of two to four parcels would have a significant effect on the environment within the meaning of 14 California Code of Regulations Section 15382. The 1995 Initial Study for the proposed subdivision and the Negative Declaration adopted by the Coastal Conservancy is attached to this document as Appendix H, along with the technical reports and site studies which support the finding of no significant impact.

Figure 1

Figure 2

C. Project History:

The following timeline illustrates the series of events relating to the Victorine Ranch property that have occurred within the last several years:

- | | |
|---------|--|
| 1984 | Monterey County completed the draft Big Sur Coast Land Use Plan, which contains a “Critical Viewshed Protection Policy” that prohibited new development that would be visible from State Highway One. The Land Use Plan authorizes the use of a Transfer of Development Credit (TDC) mechanism to help implement the Critical Viewshed policy. |
| 1985 | The State Coastal Conservancy initiated a “model TDC project” by acquiring the 100-acre Craven-Nation Property on the Victorine Ranch as a TDC receiver site and an ocean front property (the Hanna property at Kasler Point) to serve as a TDC donor site. The State Coastal Conservancy also adopted the Negative Declaration for Victorine Ranch acquisition that analyzed the potential impacts of using the property as a TDC receiver site. |
| 1987 | The Big Sur Coast Land Use Plan certified by the California Coastal Commission |
| 1989 | The Hanna property at Kasler Point approved as a TDC donor site by the Monterey County Planning Commission. |
| 1995 | State Coastal Conservancy authorized staff to submit an application for approval of a minor subdivision of the Craven-Nation property to the County of Monterey. At that time, the Conservancy found no substantial evidence that the proposed subdivision of the property from two to four parcels (using the 2 TDCs from the Kasler Point property) would have a significant effect on the environment within the meaning of 14 California Code of Regulations Section 15382 and adopted a Negative Declaration for the proposed subdivision. The Initial Study for the proposed subdivision and the Negative Declaration adopted by the Coastal Conservancy is attached to this document as Appendix H, along with the technical reports and site studies which support the finding of no significant impact. |
| 1997-98 | During the winter storms, the Victorine Ranch access road was severely damaged in two locations, including the portion of the road located on the Craven-Nation property. |
| 1998 | Coastal Conservancy management reviewed the status of the project and determined that staff’s efforts to subdivide the Craven Nation property should be curtailed and the property sold in its existing configuration as two parcels. |
| 2000 | State Coastal Conservancy adopted the “Craven-Nation Parcel Disposition Plan,” which authorized staff to sell the property in its current parcel configuration, subject to the reservation of natural resource conservation and public access easements. The Disposition Plan is attached to this document as Appendix J. The |

Coastal Conservancy also directed staff to carry out repairs to the damaged access road and authorized the disbursement of funds to accomplish this. The Coastal Conservancy found the sale of the property to be categorically exempt from review under CEQA pursuant to Public Resources Code Section 21084 and Section 15313 of the CEQA Guidelines. The Coastal Conservancy found the proposed repairs to the damaged access road to be categorically exempt from CEQA pursuant to 14 California Code of Regulations Sections 15301 and 15302. A notice of exemption pursuant to 14 California Code of Regulations Section 15062 was filed by the State Coastal Conservancy.

- 2003 Coastal Conservancy staff submitted an application to the County of Monterey for approval of a Combined Development Permit for repairs to the damaged access road. The County of Monterey staff determined that an Initial Study should be prepared for the proposed road repair and in consultation with the Coastal Conservancy staff, the Conservancy agreed to act as lead agency for the purposes of the project. The County of Monterey acknowledged that they would be a responsible agency. Upon consultation with County staff, the Coastal Conservancy acting as lead agency conducted an Initial Study for the project and prepared this Mitigated Negative Declaration.

D. Environmental Setting and Surrounding Land Uses:

Location & Vicinity

The project site is a 120 linear foot section of the access road for property owned by the Coastal Conservancy in the Victorine Ranch subdivision (Figure 1). This property, known as the “Craven –Nation property,” is currently configured as two parcels of record. The Victorine Ranch is located on the east side of State Highway One, approximately nine miles south of the City of Carmel and is bordered on the south by Garapata State Park. Access to the Craven-Nation property from Highway One is provided along the private Victorine Ranch Road, the extension of which onto the subject property is the subject of the road repair project. Surrounding uses include single-family homes and open space.

Biologically Sensitive Resources

Biological surveys of the project site and its surroundings were conducted in November 2002 to assess the environmental conditions, evaluate the general habitat features and environmental constraints at the site and within the local vicinity, and provide a basis for recommendations to minimize and avoid impacts. The proposed construction activities are likely to impact 600 square feet (.014 acre) of Smith's blue butterfly habitat, 300 square feet (.007 acre) of maritime chaparral habitat, 1,350 square feet (.031 acre) of wetland habitat, and 300 square feet (.007 acre) of riparian habitat. This acreage is extremely small given the surrounding resources.

Two special-status plant species were identified within the project API; one individual of Hookers manzanita and approximately 10 individuals of Monterey pine. No special-status wildlife species were identified during the field surveys and no additional focused wildlife surveys are suggested. Presence of the Smith's blue butterfly is assumed because approximately 20 individuals of seacliff buckwheat were identified in the API. This plant species is the obligate

reproductive host of the butterfly species and therefore has the potential to attract and sustain a Smith's blue butterfly population.

On January 28, 2003, Stephen Staub, a Registered Professional Forester, inspected the API, which is identified as the limits of grading as identified in the site plans. Ten Monterey pines, seven of which are less than two inches diameter breast height (dbh), located on and adjacent to the existing road were found. These pines appear to have been recently planted. In 2001 an adjacent landowner placed an undetermined amount of unconsolidated fill over a portion of the existing road and apparently graded it into the existing conformation.

Archaeological Resources

Archaeological Consulting conducted a survey in 1988 for a portion of the Victorine Ranch that encompasses the proposed project. Archaeological background research and surface reconnaissance revealed no surface evidence of potentially significant cultural resources. A letter

dated January 24, 2003 from Archaeological Consulting confirmed these results from the original 1988 survey and concluded that an additional archaeological reconnaissance is not needed.

Potential Geological Issues

Felicia Orah Rein, Ph.D. of Denise Duffy and Associates, Inc. completed the Erosion Control Report. The Erosion Control Report focuses on the need to protect valuable soils and watershed resources to the maximum practical extent while recognizing the limitations of a confined construction season and the project economic constraints. Best Management Practices would be incorporated to meet long-term erosion control objectives for the project.

D&M Consulting completed the Geological and Geotechnical Report in May 2003. The project site is located on highly erosive soils. According to D&M, there are a number of factors that have contributed to the observed road damage: 1) there is inadequate flow capacity at the original culvert, 2) existing fills are poorly constructed, 3) cut and fill slopes are excessively steep, 4) there is a localized presence of groundwater seepage, particularly along the cut slopes south of the creek channel crossing, and 5) the original road fills have been poorly placed and compacted. Despite these factors, the proposed road rehabilitation is feasible provided that 1) non-engineered road fills are removed and replaced with engineered fills, 2) fill reinforcement be used if slopes steeper than 2H:1V are desired, and 3) the use of localized flattening of cut slopes or use of earth retaining structures are designed to retain soils and control groundwater seepage.

III. PROJECT CONSISTENCY WITH OTHER APPLICABLE LOCAL AND STATE PLANS AND MANDATED LAWS

Use the list below to indicate plans applicable to the project and verify their consistency or non-consistency with project implementation.

General Plan/Area Plan	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Air Quality Mgmt. Plan	<input type="checkbox"/>
Specific Plan	<input type="checkbox"/>	Airport Land Use Plans	<input type="checkbox"/>
Water Quality Control Plan	<input type="checkbox"/>	Local Coastal Program-LUP	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

Monterey County certified Local Coastal Program-Big Sur Coast Land Use Plan: The Big Sur Coast Land Use Plan designates the Victorine Ranch property as having a “*Watershed and Scenic Conservation*” (WSC) land use designation. The primary objective of the WSC land use designation is to allow a district to provide for development in the more remote or mountainous areas in the Coastal Zone while protecting the significant and substantial resources of those areas. Of specific concern are the highly sensitive resources of those areas such as viewshed, watershed, plant and wildlife habitat, streams and riparian corridors. The proposed road rehabilitation is consistent with allowable uses within this designation and applicable provisions of the Local Coastal Plan and would not, as demonstrated in this environmental document, significantly impact the significant and substantial resources of the project area. Additionally, under the Disposition Plan in connection with future disposition of the property, the Coastal Conservancy will map and retain conservation easements over all environmentally sensitive habitat areas (ESHA), and will also establish and reserve a trail easement to provide for public access. These areas will not be impacted by road repairs or (because they will be subject to easements reserved by the State upon sale of the property) by reasonably foreseeable future development. Therefore, the project is considered consistent with the Monterey County Zoning Coastal Implementation Plan – Title 20 and with the Local Coastal Program’s public coastal-access requirement.

Monterey County General Plan: The project is consistent with the County General Plan policies. The General Plan consists of different elements including Natural Resources, Environmental Constraints, Area Development, as well as several others. The proposed project site is defined as rural lands and is in compliance with the applicable policies outlined under each of the above mentioned elements. The project may result in sale of the property, and future development as described in Section VII of this IS. Future uses will be subject to coastal-access easement and conservation easement to conserve and protect environmentally sensitive resource areas, particularly ESHA, as noted above. Preparation of the proposed conservation easement (by Conservancy staff in cooperation with staff of the California Coastal Commission) also involved a preliminary cultural resources reconnaissance. Conservation and protection of ESHA and the cultural reconnaissance both satisfy the policies under Natural Resources Goal 1, 7, 8, 11, and 12. The coastal-access easement also satisfies the policies under Area Development Goal 26, 27, 34, 36, and 51. The floodplain boundaries have been delineated for the project and erosion control measures have been determined; therefore, the project is in compliance with the applicable policies outlined under Environmental Constraints.

IV. ENVIRONMENTAL FACTORS POTENTIALLY AFFECTED AND DETERMINATION

A. FACTORS

The environmental factors checked below would be potentially affected by this project, as discussed within the checklist on the following pages.

- | | | |
|--|--|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Aesthetics | <input type="checkbox"/> Agriculture Resources | <input type="checkbox"/> Air Quality |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Biological Resources | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Cultural Resources | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Geology/Soils |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Hazards/Hazardous Materials | <input type="checkbox"/> Hydrology/Water Quality | <input type="checkbox"/> Land Use/Planning |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Mineral Resources | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Noise | <input type="checkbox"/> Population/Housing |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Public Services | <input type="checkbox"/> Recreation | <input type="checkbox"/> Transportation/Traffic |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Utilities/Service Systems | | |

Some proposed applications that are not exempt from CEQA review may have little or no potential for adverse environmental impacts related to most of the topics in the Environmental Checklist; and/or potential impacts may involve only a few limited subject areas. These types of projects are generally minor in scope, located in a non-sensitive environment, and are easily identifiable and without public controversy. For the environmental issue areas where there is no potential for significant environmental impact (and not checked above), the following finding can be made using the project description, environmental setting, or other information as supporting evidence for the road repair project. Refer to Section VII of this IS for an impact discussion of potential foreseeable actions that may occur on the Coastal Conservancy property.

FINDING: For the above referenced topics that are not checked off, there is no potential for significant environmental impact to occur from either construction, operation or maintenance of the proposed road repair project and no further discussion in the Environmental Checklist is necessary.

EVIDENCE: **Aesthetics:** The road repair project will not be visible from Highway 1.

Agriculture Resources: The site is not currently zoned for agricultural use and is not under a Williamson Act contract. Therefore, the project will not result in an impact to agricultural resources. Surrounding properties are in residential use and/or open space.

Hazards/Hazardous Materials: The road repair project will not result in storage and/or application of fertilizers or chemicals.

Hydrology/Water Quality: The road repair project will not generate significant hydrologic or water quality impacts. Drainage conditions will be improved through Best Management Practices and erosion control measures.

Land Use/Planning: The road repair project will not divide an established community or conflict with any applicable policies or regulations.

Mineral Resources: The project will not result in the loss of availability of a state or locally important mineral resource recovery site delineated on the Monterey County General Plan.

Population/Housing: The road repair project is not residential in nature and will not substantially induce growth or displace housing or people.

Public Services: Due to the small size and nature of the road repair project, public services will not be significantly impacted.

Recreation: The project will not increase the use of existing regional parks or other recreational facilities such that substantial physical deterioration of the area would occur or be accelerated.

Transportation/Traffic: During construction, access to the adjacent property not will be obstructed. There is no other development beyond the storm-damaged road and therefore no required access beyond the adjacent property. Therefore, the proposed road repair would not impact transportation or traffic during or after construction.

Utilities/Service Systems: The project does not involve utilities/service systems and will not violate any statutes or regulations.

B. DETERMINATION

On the basis of this initial evaluation:

- ☐ I find that the proposed project COULD NOT have a significant effect on the environment, and a NEGATIVE DECLARATION will be prepared.
- ☒ I find that although the proposed project could have a significant effect on the environment there will not be a significant effect in this case because revisions in the project have been made by or agreed to by the project proponent. A MITIGATED NEGATIVE DECLARATION will be prepared.
- ☐ I find that the proposed project MAY have a significant effect on the environment, and an ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT is required.
- ☐ I find that the proposed project MAY have a “potentially significant impact” or “potentially significant unless mitigated” impact on the environment, but at least one effect 1) has been adequately analyzed in an earlier document pursuant to applicable legal standards, and 2) has been addressed by mitigation measures based on the earlier analysis as described on attached sheets. An ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT is required, but it must analyze only the effects that remain to be addressed.
- ☐ I find that although the proposed project could have a significant effect on the environment, because all potentially significant effects (a) have been analyzed adequately in an earlier EIR or NEGATIVE DECLARATION pursuant to applicable standards, and (b) have been avoided or mitigated pursuant to that earlier EIR or NEGATIVE

DECLARATION, including revisions or mitigation measures that are imposed upon the proposed project, nothing further is required.

_____ Signature	_____ Date
<i>Prentiss F. Williams</i> _____ Printed Name	<i>Project Manager</i> _____ Title

V. EVALUATION OF ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS

- 1) A brief explanation is required for all answers except “No Impact” answers that are adequately supported by the information sources a lead agency cites in the parentheses following each question. A “No Impact” answer is adequately supported if the referenced information sources show that the impact simply does not apply to projects like the one involved (e.g., the project falls outside a fault rupture zone). A “No Impact” answer should be explained where it is based on project-specific factors as well as general standards (e.g., the project will not expose sensitive receptors to pollutants, based on project-specific screening analysis).
- 2) All answers must take into account the whole action involved, including offsite as well as onsite, cumulative as well as project-level, indirect as well as direct, and construction as well as operational impacts.
- 3) Once the lead agency has determined that a particular physical impact may occur, then the checklist answers must indicate whether the impact is potentially significant, less than significant with mitigation, or less than significant. "Potentially Significant Impact" is appropriate if there is substantial evidence that an effect may be significant. If there are one or more "Potentially Significant Impact" entries when the determination is made, an EIR is required.
- 4) "Negative Declaration: Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated" applies where the incorporation of mitigation measures has reduced an effect from "Potentially Significant Impact" to a "Less Than Significant Impact." The lead agency must describe the mitigation measures, and briefly explain how they reduce the effect to a less than significant level (mitigation measures from Section XVII, "Earlier Analyses," may be cross-referenced).
- 5) Earlier analyses may be used where, pursuant to the tiering, program EIR, or other CEQA process, an effect has been adequately analyzed in an earlier EIR or negative declaration. Section 15063(c)(3)(D). In this case, a brief discussion should identify the following:
 - a) Earlier Analysis Used. Identify and state where they are available for review.

- b) Impacts Adequately Addressed. Identify which effects from the above checklist were within the scope of and adequately analyzed in an earlier document pursuant to applicable legal standards, and state whether such effects were addressed by mitigation measures based on the earlier analysis.
 - c) Mitigation Measures. For effects that are "Less than Significant with Mitigation Measures Incorporated," describe the mitigation measures, which were incorporated or refined from the earlier document and the extent to which they address site-specific conditions for the project.
- 6) Lead agencies are encouraged to incorporate into the checklist references to information sources for potential impacts (e.g., general plans, zoning ordinances). Reference to a previously prepared or outside document should, where appropriate, include a reference to the page or pages where the statement is substantiated.
- 7) Supporting Information Sources: A source list should be attached, and other sources used or individuals contacted should be cited in the discussion.
- 8) The explanation of each issue should identify:
 - a) The significance criteria or threshold, if any, used to evaluate each question; and
 - b) The mitigation measure identified, if any, to reduce the impact to less than significance.

VI. ENVIRONMENTAL CHECKLIST

1. AESTHETICS		Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
Would the project:					
a)	Have a substantial adverse effect on a scenic vista? (Sources: 1, 2, 3, 4)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
b)	Substantially damage scenic resources, including, but not limited to, trees, rock outcroppings, and historic buildings within a state scenic highway? (Sources: 1, 2, 3, 4)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
c)	Substantially degrade the existing visual character or quality of the site and its surroundings? (Sources: 1, 2, 3, 4)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
d)	Create a new source of substantial light or glare which would adversely affect day or nighttime views in the area? (Sources: 1, 2, 3, 4)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

Discussion/Conclusion:

The existing road does not have a significant environmental impact on aesthetics and the road rehabilitation project will not increase the impacts. The road is not located within the critical viewshed sight lines from Highway One. See previous Sections II. A (*Project Description*) and B (*Environmental Setting*) and Section IV. A (*Environmental Factors Potentially Affected*), as well as the sources referenced. Refer to the Biological Resources Section for a discussion regarding trees; also refer to Section VII.

2. AGRICULTURAL RESOURCES		Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
Would the project:					
a)	Convert Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, or Farmland of Statewide Importance (Farmland), as shown on the maps prepared pursuant to the Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program of the California Resources Agency, to non-agricultural use? (Sources: 1, 2, 3, 4)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
b)	Conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use, or a Williamson Act contract? (Sources: 1, 2, 3, 4)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

2. AGRICULTURAL RESOURCES

In determining whether impacts to agricultural resources are significant environmental effects, lead agencies may refer to the California Agricultural Land Evaluation and Site Assessment Model (1997) prepared by the California Dept. of Conservation as an optional model to use in assessing impacts on agriculture and farmland.

Would the project:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
c) Involve other changes in the existing environment which, due to their location or nature, could result in conversion of Farmland, to non-agricultural use? (Sources: 1, 2, 3, 4)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

Discussion/Conclusion:

See previous Sections II. A (*Project Description*) and B (*Environmental Setting*) and Section IV. A (*Environmental Factors Potentially Affected*), as well as the sources referenced.

3. AIR QUALITY

Where available, the significance criteria established by the applicable air quality management or air pollution control district may be relied upon to make the following determinations.

Would the project:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
a) Conflict with or obstruct implementation of the applicable air quality plan? (Sources: 1, 2, 3, 4)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
b) Violate any air quality standard or contribute substantially to an existing or projected air quality violation? (Sources: 1, 2, 3, 4)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
c) Result in a cumulatively considerable net increase of any criteria pollutant for which the project region is non-attainment under an applicable federal or state ambient air quality standard (including releasing emissions which exceed quantitative thresholds for ozone precursors)? (Sources: 1, 2, 3, 4)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
d) Result in significant construction-related air quality impacts? (Source: 1, 2, 3, 4)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
e) Expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations? (Sources: 1, 2, 3, 4)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
f) Create objectionable odors affecting a substantial number of people? (Sources: 1, 2, 3, 4)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

Discussion:

The Air Quality Management Plan (AQMP) for the Monterey Bay Region is prepared by the Monterey Bay Unified Air Pollution Control District (MBUAPCD) addresses the attainment and maintenance of State and federal ambient air quality standards within the North Central Coast Air Basin.

Preliminary grading estimates for the proposed Victorine Ranch Road Rehabilitation project are approximately 336 cu. yds. of cut and 267 yds. of fill, total. Normally, cut volumes "shrink" due to recompaction, settlement and general losses. The typical shrinkage factor is about 15 percent, which is close to the difference in the cut and fill volumes. After shrinkage, an excess of about 19 cubic yards is expected. Actual field conditions may vary; all leftover soil (if any) will be trucked to an approved site or to the landfill in Marina. The volumes are minimal.

This amount of grading will result in minor increases in emissions from construction vehicles and dust generation. However, there is the potential that project related construction activities may result in a temporary increase in localized levels of PM₁₀. Therefore, construction activities will be required to comply with the AQMP, including the standard MBUAPCD measures addressing dust control. Implementation of these standard dust-control measures will maintain any temporary increases in PM₁₀ at less than significant levels. Therefore, the proposed project will not have a significant adverse impact upon air quality.

Conclusion:

The proposed road repair project will not have a significant adverse impact upon air quality since impacts will be temporary and construction-related. Sensitive receptors will not be impacted due to the required implementation of standard dust-control measures. Mitigation measures are not required.

4. BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
Would the project:				
a) Have a substantial adverse effect, either directly or through habitat modifications, on any species identified as a candidate, sensitive, or special status species in local or regional plans, policies, or regulations, or by the California Department of Fish and Game or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service? (Sources: 1, 2, 3, 4, 7)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b) Have a substantial adverse effect on any riparian habitat or other sensitive natural community identified in local or regional plans, policies, or regulations or by the California Department of Fish and Game or US Fish and Wildlife Service? (Sources: 1, 2, 3, 4, 7)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c) Have a substantial adverse effect on federally protected wetlands as defined by Section 404 of the Clean Water Act (including, but not limited to, marsh, vernal pool, coastal, etc.) through direct removal, filling, hydrological interruption, or other means? (Sources: 1, 2, 3, 4, 7)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
d) Interfere substantially with the movement of any native resident or migratory fish or wildlife species or with established native resident or migratory wildlife corridors, or impede the use of native wildlife nursery sites? (Sources: 1, 2, 3, 4, 7)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
e) Conflict with any local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources, such as a tree preservation policy or ordinance? (Sources: 1, 2, 3, 4, 7, 8)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
f) Conflict with the provisions of an adopted Habitat Conservation Plan, Natural Community Conservation Plan, or other approved local, regional, or state habitat conservation plan? (Sources: 1, 2, 3, 4, 7, 8)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

Discussion:

DD&A and Stephen R. Staub completed the Biological Assessment (Appendix A) and Forestry Management Plan (Appendix B), respectively, for the proposed road rehabilitation. The following discussion is based on these reports and appropriate mitigation identified.

The entire Craven-Nation property was surveyed for sensitive habitats in 1988. The project site was surveyed again in 2002. Sensitive habitats include riparian corridors, wetlands, habitats for legally protected species, areas of high biological diversity, areas supporting rare or special-status wildlife habitat, and unusual or regionally restricted habitat types. Habitat types considered sensitive include those listed on the CNDDDB's working list of high priority and rare natural communities habitats (i.e., those habitats that are Rare or Endangered within the borders of California) (CDFG, 1999), those that are critical habitat in accordance with the Endangered Species Act, and those that are defined as Environmentally Sensitive Habitat Areas (ESHA) under the Coastal Act.

Sheer cliffs and bluffs at the waters edge and steep sloping uplands of the western Santa Lucia Mountains dominate this portion of the Big Sur coastline. Powerful winds and salt spray are ever-present forces that tend to keep the scrub and chaparral vegetation low growing. Forests dominate in more protected areas at higher elevations above the project site. In this region, some of the flatter areas support native perennial bunch grasses and forbs.

Habitat Types

The project site consists of a mosaic of different habitat types, which are described below.

Grassland

Portions of the API are dominated by annual invasive plant grass species including ripgut grass (*Bromus diandrus*), wild oat grass (*Avena fatua*), and quaking grass (*Briza maxima*). The non-natives become established after disturbance episodes, such as overgrazing, removal of native species through development, and erosion.

Areas dominated by native perennial bunchgrasses form a plant community type called coastal prairie. Coastal prairies occur on poorly drained soils in areas subject to a marine influence and may occur on a series of former coastal terraces that have been moved inland and uplifted. Dominant species include red fescue (*Festuca rubra*) and California oat grass (*Danthonia californica*). Although there is no coastal prairie within or adjacent to the API, this habitat type is likely present on other portions of the Victorine Ranch.

Coastal Scrub

Soft-leafed, drought-deciduous shrubs dominate coastal scrub. Coastal scrub occurs on well-drained shallow sandy or rocky soils, often on south-facing slopes. The community is typified by California sagebrush (*Artemisia californica*), black sage (*Salvia mellifera*) coyote brush (*Baccharis pilularis*), sticky monkey flower (*Mimulus aurantiacus*), and may include coffeeberry (*Rhamnus californica*) and herbaceous species such as buckwheat (*Eriogonum* sp.) and golden yarrow (*Eriophyllum conterfitiflorum*).

Chamise Chaparral

Chaparral typically requires more moisture than coastal sage scrub and forms on shallow soils, along dry rocky slopes and ridges or relic sand dunes. Chaparral is characterized by evergreen, sclerophyllus (hard-leafed) shrubs such as manzanita (*Arctostaphylos* sp.), chamise (*Adenostoma fasciculata*), and ceanothus (*Ceanothus* sp.). The majority of the chaparral in or adjacent to the API is dominated by chamise.

Maritime Chaparral

Maritime chaparral occurs in areas where a maritime influence (coastal fog and moderate temperatures) effectively improves available moisture. A high diversity of sclerophyllus shrubs of moderate to high density, including shaggy-barked manzanita (*Arctostaphylos tomentosa*), typifies this community. This community is well known because of the high number of endemic and special-status species such as Toro manzanita (*Arctostaphylos montereyensis*), Monterey ceanothus (*Ceanothus cuneatus* var. *rigidus*), Eastwood's golden bush (*Ericameria fasciculata*), sandmat manzanita (*Arctostaphylos pumila*), Monterey spineflower (*Chorizanthe pungens* var. *pungens*), and sand gilia (*Gilia tenuiflora* ssp. *arenaria*). Other herbaceous species found in openings include golden yarrow (*Eriophyllum confertiflorum*) and Fremont's zigadenus (*Zigadenus fremontii*). The small amount of maritime chaparral within the API contained only individual special-status species: Hooker's manzanita (*Arctostaphylos hookeri*).

Riparian

Willow riparian scrub is present within the API. This habitat type is dominated by small, wind-blown, shrubby arroyo willow (*Salix lasiolepis*). The understory contains a variety of upland and wetland plant species including Douglas iris (*Iris douglasii*), sticky monkey flower, poison hemlock (*Conium maculatum*), and native blackberry (*Rubus ursinus*).

Wetland

Seasonal, herbaceous wetlands exist within the drainage swale. This assertion is based on the presence of one or more dominant plant species with Service indicator status of facultative or wetter. Plants such as common rush (*Juncus effusus*), sickle-leaved rush (*J. falcatus*), spreading rush (*J. patens*), and poison hemlock dominate the small pockets of wetland.

Plants

Two special-status plant species were identified within the project API: one individual of Hooker's manzanita, and approximately 12 individuals of Monterey pine. Both species are CNPS list 1B and are typically provided management consideration during the CEQA process. Only four of the Monterey pines are larger than two inches dbh (A Forester's Report was prepared by Stephen Staub on February 17, 2003, and is included as Appendix B).

Wildlife

No special-status wildlife species have been documented to occur on the project site and none were identified during the field surveys. No additional focused wildlife surveys are suggested. However, as mentioned in the summary, Smith's blue butterflies are assumed present based on the presence of their obligate reproductive host plant. Below are species narratives for the special-status wildlife species on the CNDDDB list.

Steelhead Trout

Steelhead trout (*Oncorhynchus mykiss*) are federally Threatened. Steelhead is the anadromous form of rainbow trout. In North America, steelhead are found in Pacific Ocean drainages from southern California to Alaska. In California, known spawning populations are found in coastal streams from Malibu Creek in Los Angeles County to the Smith River near the Oregon border, and in the Sacramento and San Joaquin River systems. The intermittent drainage located in the project API is not capable of supporting steelhead because it does not flow for the necessary length of time during the average year.

Monarch Butterfly

Monarch butterflies (*Danaus plexippus*) are listed by the CDFG as a “species of special concern.” Each fall the monarchs fly west and south to the same overwintering sites, and frequently to the same trees. In California, the butterflies cluster in these sites from approximately October to February. In the spring they depart, flying north and east to search for milkweed plants on which the females lay their eggs.

A dwindling number of groves along the California coast have the characteristics necessary to support overwintering butterflies. Overwintering habitat characteristics include species composition and protection from wind and storms within the grove. Climactic conditions that scientists call the “microclimate” describes the specific temperatures, wind velocity, sunlight, and humidity inside the grove which is appropriate to support the species. There are no appropriate groves located in the project API.

Smith’s Blue Butterfly

The Smith’s blue butterfly (*Euphilotes enoptes smithi*) is a federally Endangered species, which historically ranged along the coast from Monterey Bay south through Big Sur to near Point Gorda, occurring in scattered populations in association with coastal dune, coastal scrub, chaparral, and grassland habitats. They spend their entire lives in association with two buckwheat plants in the genus *Eriogonum*.

The primary factor that limits populations of Smith’s blue butterfly is the occurrence of host plants, seacliff buckwheat (*E. parvifolium*) and coast buckwheat (*E. latifolium*). Adult emergence and seasonal activity is synchronized with the blooming period of the particular buckwheat used at a given site. At a particular location, adults are active for about four to eight weeks, but the adult activity period and duration can vary dramatically from year-to-year and from one location to another. Individual adult males and females live approximately one week. The presence of the host plant, however, is not always an indication of the occurrence of the butterfly. The occurrence of these plants is much more extensive than the distribution of the butterfly.

Although no Smith’s blue butterflies were identified in the API, the species is assumed to be present based on the presence of the obligate reproductive host plant seacliff buckwheat. Approximately 20 individual plants were identified in the API during the field survey. Additional focused surveys might reveal that the butterflies do not currently occupy the area; however, this does not preclude the use in the future and therefore, does not reduce the impact to the habitat.

The permits that will likely be necessary for the proposed project include:

- Section 404 of the Clean Water Act (Army Corps of Engineers)
- Section 401 of the Clean Water Act (Regional Water Quality Control Board)
- Fish and Game Code 1601 Streambed Alteration Agreement (California Department of Fish and Game)
- Letter of “No Adverse Effect” or a Section 10 incidental take permit and Habitat Conservation Plan (U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service)

Conclusion:

The results of field surveys in the Area of Potential Impact (API) for the Victorine Ranch Access Road Rehabilitation Project indicates the proposed construction activities are likely to impact the following habitat types:

- Three hundred square feet (.007 acre) of maritime chaparral habitat, which is included on the California Department of Fish and Game’s list of high priority habitats.
- One thousand three hundred and fifty square feet (.031 acre) of wetland habitat regulated by the Army Corps of Engineers.
- Three hundred square feet (.007 acre) of riparian habitat regulated by the California Department of Fish and Game.
- Twenty individuals of seaciff buckwheat (*Eriogonum parvifolium*), the obligate reproductive host of the federally Endangered Smith’s blue butterfly (*Euphilotes enoptes smithi*), were identified in the API. Therefore, presence of the butterfly is assumed due to the plants potential to attract and sustain a Smith’s blue butterfly population.

Two special-status plant species were identified within the project API:

- One individual of Hooker’s manzanita (*Arctostaphylos hookeri*).
- Approximately 12 individuals of Monterey pine (*Pinus radiata*).

Only four of the Monterey pines are larger than two inches (dbh). All four of these trees will be retained. A double pine with trunk diameters of 15” and 22” dbh and approximately 45’ tall occurs at the outer edge of the road just before the lath marked #2014. Approximately 15’ east of lath #2014 and then 20’ upslope (and 12’ beyond the top of the cutbank) is a 21” dbh Monterey pine that is approximately 40’ tall and has some fire scars on its bark. Two other pines roughly 15” and 22” in diameter occur not far above the road cutbank well south of the proposed culvert crossing. The Forester’s report suggests that the eight remaining seedlings were planted recently and are of unknown genetic origin. For these reasons, Mr. Staub recommends removing the smaller trees without replacement. No other trees greater than 2 inches dbh were identified in the API.

No special-status wildlife species were identified during the field surveys and no additional focused wildlife surveys are suggested.

With the incorporation of the following mitigation measures, all potential impacts to biotic resources will be avoided or reduced to less-than-significant levels.

Mitigations:

The mitigation measures and monitoring actions listed in this section are presented in the biological report prepared for the project, and are pursuant to the recommendations made therein (Reference #7). It is expected that the project site will support the same or more sensitive habitat after construction than it currently does. This is due to the design configuration of the road improvement, which will allow inundation of the area behind or upstream of the new road alignment and proposed plantings of maritime chaparral plant species and buckwheat.

Mitigation Measure 1 – Maritime Chaparral

A) Site Restoration for the Maritime Chaparral

1. A qualified biologist shall implement specific methods for replanting maritime chaparral that is disturbed prior to the road construction as described below:
 - a. Prior to the initiation of construction activities a qualified biologist shall remove cuttings from existing maritime chaparral species (i.e., *Arctostaphylos* sp. and *Ceanothus* sp.) including the lone existing Hooker's manzanita (*Arctostaphylos hookeri*) in areas that will be impacted. Enough cuttings shall be collected to ensure appropriate replanting of three hundred square feet (.007 acre) at one foot center planting densities.
 - b. These cuttings shall be cultivated either on, or off-site for the duration of the construction activities and until they are ready to be transplanted.
 - c. The cultivated plants will be transplanted into areas that have been disturbed by construction activities.

Monitoring Action 1

A) Site Restoration and Planting Plan

1. A qualified biologist shall incorporate success criteria into the Site Restoration and Planting Plan after planting;
2. A qualified biologist shall monitor the restoration for five years following the planting;
3. A qualified biologist shall implement adaptive management options if the criteria are not met; and
4. The applicant shall implement a long-term funding mechanism prior to completion of the planting.

Mitigation Measure 2 – Wetland Habitat

A) Site Restoration for the wetland habitat

1. A qualified biologist shall implement specific methods for restoration and planting wetland areas that are disturbed prior to the road construction as described below.
 - a. Prior to the initiation of construction activities a qualified biologist shall harvest existing wetland plant species including common rush (*Juncus effusus*), sickle-leaved rush (*J. falcatus*), and spreading rush (*J. patens*) that will be impacted. Enough plants shall be collected to ensure appropriate replanting of one thousand three hundred and fifty square feet (.031 acre) at one foot center planting densities.

- b. The harvested plants shall be stored on-site for the duration of the construction activities and until they are ready to be transplanted.
 - c. The stored plants will be transplanted into wetland areas that have been disturbed or created by construction activities.
- B) The Army Corps of Engineers shall concur that the project mitigation is sufficient to be authorized under the Nationwide Permit prior to the initiation of construction activities.

Monitoring Action 2

- A) Evidence of Army Corps of Engineers concurrence shall include a signed letter authorizing the Nationwide Permit.

Mitigation Measure 3 – Riparian Habitat

- A) Site Restoration for the riparian habitat
 - 1. A qualified biologist shall implement specific methods for restoration and planting riparian areas that are disturbed prior to the road construction as described below.
 - a. Prior to the initiation of construction activities a qualified biologist shall remove cuttings of riparian shrub species [i.e., Arroyo Willow (*Salix lasiolepis*)] that will be impacted as part of the project. Enough cuttings should be collected to ensure appropriate replanting of three hundred square feet (.007 acre) at one foot center planting densities.
 - b. The cuttings shall be stored on-site for the duration of the construction activities and until they are ready to be transplanted.
 - c. The stored cuttings will be transplanted into riparian areas that have been disturbed or created by construction activities.
- B) The California Department of Fish and Game (CDFG) shall concur that the project mitigation is sufficient to be authorized by a Streambed Alteration Agreement prior to the initiation of construction activities.

Monitoring Action 3

- A.) Evidence of CDFG concurrence shall include a signed letter authorizing the Streambed Alteration Agreement.

Mitigation Measure 4 – Seacliff Buckwheat

- A) The Site Restoration for seacliff buckwheat.
 - 1. A qualified biologist shall implement specific methods for replanting seacliff buckwheat that is disturbed prior to the road construction as described below.
 - a. Prior to the initiation of construction activities a qualified biologist shall harvest seacliff buckwheat plants that will be impacted as part of the project.
 - b. The plants shall be stored on-site for the duration of the construction activities and until they are ready to be transplanted.
 - c. The stored plants will be transplanted into areas which are appropriate to sustain the plants that have been disturbed or created by construction activities.
- B) This document shall be reviewed by the United States Fish and Wildlife Service (Service) to obtain their concurrence that the project will not result in the take of federally listed species.

Monitoring Action 4

- A) Evidence of Service concurrence shall include a signed letter verifying authorization that the project will not result in the take of federally listed species.

Mitigation Measure 5 – Hookers Manzanita

- A) Refer to Mitigation Measure 1.

Monitoring Action 5

- B) Refer to Monitoring Action 1.

Mitigation Measure 6 – Monterey Pine

- A) Mitigation Measures for the double pine
 1. Prior to construction initiation, a qualified arborist shall ensure that the root system and trunk of the double pine at the existing road's outer edge will be protected from unnecessary disturbance and compaction by construction activities. No fill shall be allowed to rest in contact with the trunk of this tree or within its dripline;
 2. Prior to construction initiation, a qualified arborist shall ensure that tree limbs interfering with equipment operation and passage are pruned in advance of road rehabilitation; and
 3. Prior to construction initiation, a qualified arborist shall ensure that the bottom 8' of the tree's trunk is protected by wrapping it with protective materials sufficient to withstand inadvertent contact with machine buckets or blades.
- B) Prior to planting, a qualified forester or arborist shall be consulted to assure that pine planting stock is of truly native and local (on the coast from Point Lobos south to Malpaso Creek).

Monitoring Action 6

- A) A qualified biologist shall monitor the restoration for five years following the planting. Annual reporting shall be completed by the biologist and submitted to the lead agency implementing the mitigation monitoring program. A final report will be prepared in year five.
- B) The replanting and restoration described above will be successful if 80 percent of all plants installed survive after five years. Plants which die will be replaced with local stock each year, for the first four years, based on annual reports. If the project does not meet the success criteria in the final monitoring report, an analysis of the potential reasons for failure and suggestions for future actions shall be provided. The Coastal Conservancy authorized staff to disburse up to \$100,000 to complete the road repair. Conservancy staff has recently obtained an updated cost estimate for the road repair project that includes the estimated costs of implementing all of the mitigation measures and monitoring actions described in this document. Based on the updated cost estimates, staff will request authorization for the additional funding needed to implement the mitigation measures and monitoring actions described in this document, including suggestions provided in the final monitoring report in the event that the replanting and restoration efforts do not meet the established success criteria, at its public meeting on September 15, 2004.

5. CULTURAL RESOURCES				
Would the project:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
a) Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource as defined in 15064.5? (Sources: 1, 2, 3, 11, 12)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
b) Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of an archaeological resource pursuant to 15064.5? (Sources: 1, 2, 3, 11, 12)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c) Directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource or site or unique geologic feature? (Sources: 1, 2, 3, 11, 12)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
d) Disturb any human remains, including those interred outside of formal cemeteries? (Sources: 1, 11, 12)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Discussion:

Archaeological Resources

Archaeological Consulting completed the Preliminary Cultural Resources Reconnaissance of a Portion of the Victorine Ranch in October 1988 (Appendix C), which included the proposed project area. In a letter dated January 24, 2003 from Archaeological Consulting (Appendix D), it was confirmed that the 1988 survey is valid and there is no need to complete another archaeological reconnaissance survey or an evaluation of the road rehabilitation project impacts.

Mitigation:

The possibility always exists that unidentified (buried) cultural resources may be discovered during construction. Therefore, the following standard language, or the equivalent, shall be included in any permits issued within the project area:

“If archaeological or human remains are accidentally discovered during construction, work shall be halted within 50 meters (150 feet) of the find until it can be evaluated by a qualified professional archaeologist. If the find is determined to be significant, appropriate mitigation measures shall be formulated and implemented.”

6. GEOLOGY AND SOILS		Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
Would the project:					
a)	Expose people or structures to potential substantial adverse effects, including the risk of loss, injury, or death involving:				
i)	Rupture of a known earthquake fault, as delineated on the most recent Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zoning Map issued by the State Geologist for the area or based on other substantial evidence of a known fault? (Sources: 1, 2, 3, 9, 10, 13) Refer to Division of Mines and Geology Special Publication 42.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
ii)	Strong seismic ground shaking? (Source: 1, 2, 3, 9, 10, 13)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
iii)	Seismic-related ground failure, including liquefaction? (Sources: 1, 2, 3, 9, 10, 13)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
iv)	Landslides? (Sources: 1, 2, 3, 9, 10, 13)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
b)	Result in substantial soil erosion or the loss of topsoil? (Sources: 1, 2, 3, 9, 10, 13)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c)	Be located on a geologic unit or soil that is unstable, or that would become unstable as a result of the project, and potentially result in on- or off-site landslide, lateral spreading, subsidence, liquefaction or collapse? (Sources: 1, 2, 3, 9, 10, 13)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
d)	Be located on expansive soil, as defined in Table 18-1-B of the Uniform Building Code (1994), creating substantial risks to life or property? (Sources: 1, 2, 3, 9, 10)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
e)	Have soils incapable of adequately supporting the use of septic tanks or alternative wastewater disposal systems where sewers are not available for the disposal of wastewater? (Sources: 1, 2, 3, 9, 10)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

Discussion:

Relevant Project Characteristics

The proposed project consists of replacing a 120 linear foot portion of the existing access road that was washed out in the 1997-98 winter storms events. The access road was severely damaged in the winter storms and needs to be repaired to enable vehicular traffic. The restored road will follow the original road alignment except at the creek channel crossing. The new crossing will be located approximately 50 feet west (downstream) of the original crossing. A 46-foot long, 36-inch diameter culvert will be placed under the road to facilitate future storm flow

(see Figure 2). Approximately 336 cubic yards of cut and 267 cubic yards of fill will be moved to construct a new drainage crossing. The proposed alignment of the road will be changed slightly. This change will slightly shorten and stabilize the extreme curve that previously existed prior to the storm damage, improving safety and reducing erosion potential.

Soils

D&M Consulting Engineers, Inc. completed the Geological and Geotechnical Report (Appendix E). According to their findings, the geologic units encountered along the project alignment include man-made road fill, alluvial and colluvial soils, Quaternary terrace deposits, and Mesozoic granite. These materials are exposed along the alignment, or nearby, in road cuts, erosion gullies, and in natural channels. According to the information contained in the Monterey County Geographic Information System (GIS), the project area has a moderate susceptibility for landslides. The erosion risk is high and the risk of liquefaction is low.

Both colluvial and alluvial soils are derived from weathering of bedrock material. Colluvial soils comprise the soil mantle overlying adjacent hillsides. The colluvial soil mantle exposed by road cuts along the alignment generally consists of loose sandy silt containing many roots, voids, and fragments of weathered rock. The colluvium is typically no more than one- to two-feet thick. Alluvial soils occur within and along the bottom of the seasonal creek and its minor tributary drainages. Alluvium within the seasonal drainage consists of a variable mixture of silt, sand, and rounded gravel to boulder-sized clasts derived largely from granite. The thickness of the alluvium at the proposed road channel crossing is not known, but it is likely to average only a few feet deep.

Erosion

The Geological and Geotechnical Report indicates that the project site is located on highly erosive soils (Figure 3). According to D&M, existing man-made fills are poorly constructed, cut and fill slopes are excessively steep (Figure 4), and there is a localized presence of groundwater seepage, particularly along the cut slopes south of the creek channel crossing. The existing road fill has little cohesion and is prone to erosion. Man-made fill occurs along most of the outside (down slope) edge of the road alignment as a narrow wedge of side cast soil. A deeply eroded gully crosses the road immediately south of the original creek channel. Where exposed to the gully sidewalls, the road fill consists of loose to medium dense, gravelly and sandy silt that appears to have been placed directly on the native soils without keying, benching, or compaction in horizontal layers. The gully is incised as much as seven feet below the original road grade exposing the fill and underlying soils and bedrock. A small side gully entering this deeper gully from the southwest suggests that some of the flow through the gully originates from cut-bank seepage or from runoff from upslope. Other gullies, shallow slumps, and a landslide area described in the Geotechnical Report all indicate that these soils are highly erosive.

Figure 3 – Erosion Rating Map

Figure 4 – 30% Slope Map

Seismicity

According to the information contained in the Monterey County Geographic Information System (GIS), the project area has a moderate susceptibility for earthquakes. The road rehabilitation project is not considered to be at significant risk from tsunamis. No active faults have been mapped across the project site. However, ground shaking at the site can occur as a result of an earthquake on one of the active regional faults. The San Andreas Fault, an active fault, is located 56 km from the project site. Other active faults in the vicinity include the San Gregorio fault (3 km from the project site), Monterey Bay – Tulcaritos (12 km), and Rinconada (27 km). In order to maintain plan consistency and to reduce potential seismic-related impacts to less-than-significant levels, necessary mitigation measures are designed to address impacts that could result from an active fault.

According to preliminary engineering studies and environmental analysis conducted by the Coastal Conservancy in 1988 and the Geological and Geotechnical Report completed in 2003 (Appendix H and E), the soils of the Craven-Nation property are stable and no geological hazards such as landslides were identified. Percolation tests indicated that soils on this portion of the property would be suitable for the proposed road repair project. Refer to Section VII.

Mitigation measures are based on the consulting geologist's recommendations and the Erosion Control Plan completed by Denise Duffy & Associates, Inc. (Appendix G). Mitigation measures are listed below and are required in order to minimize potential impacts resulting from the seismic risk in the project areas to less-than-significant levels.

Conclusion:

The proposed road repair project is geologically feasible, provided the recommendations presented by D&M Consulting Engineers, Inc. are incorporated into design and construction of the road rehabilitation. The recommendations of D&M Consulting Engineers, Inc., with respect to the road repair project are included in the mitigation measures discussed below.

Mitigations:

Mitigation Measure 7 – In order to reduce the risk of geologic impacts to the road rehabilitation to less-than-significant levels, the following mitigation measures shall be followed:

- A) Prior removal of existing non-engineered road fills and their replacement with engineered fills, a grading permit must be issued. Whitson Engineers specified that all fill shall be compacted to a minimum of 90 percent relative compaction, based on ASTM test D1557, except that the upper six inches of all subgrade areas below future pavement sections. Other areas to receive improvements shall be compacted to a minimum of 95 percent relative compaction.
- B) If fill slopes steeper than 2H:1V are desired, fill reinforcement shall be used.
- C) Prior to the issuance of grading permits, localized flattening of cut slopes or use of earth retaining structures shall be designed by the engineer to accommodate both earth materials and groundwater conditions by retaining soils and controlling groundwater seepage.

Monitoring Action 7 – Prior to the issuance of grading permits:

- A) Planning and Building Inspection Department (PBID) staff shall review and verify that all grading plans bear the wet-seal stamp, date, and signature of a registered geologist or certified engineering geologist and a certified geotechnical engineer, indicating that the plans adequately incorporate the recommendations of these consulting professionals for reducing seismic-related impacts to less-than-significant levels.

Mitigation Measure 8 - In order to minimize on-site transport of soil by reducing soil disturbance and intercepting and capturing soils displaced from disturbed areas during construction, a Construction Erosion Control Plan shall be implemented.

A) Grading and Drainage

- 1) Mass grading operations shall be restricted to seasonal periods of minimal rainfall (April 15 - October 15). Where site-specific grading during the wet season is proposed, specific erosion control measures should be implemented as authorized by the Director of Building Inspection and all work should be in compliance with Section 16.12.090 of the Monterey County Erosion Control Ordinance.
- 2) Mass grade operations shall implement runoff capture and controlled release. If work is conducted during the dry season, it is unlikely that there will be any water in the drainage channel. If flow should be present, flow velocities shall be detained or filtered through the use of berms, straw wattles, sediment traps, and/or vegetative buffer strips to prevent the escape of sediment from the site. No access or grading shall be permitted while raining and vehicle movement on dirt roads should be minimized during storm events.
- 3) Excess outlet velocities from the new 36-inch drainage culvert shall be controlled through rock riprap protection and/or other energy dissipaters. Culvert discharges to the seasonal stream crossing shall occur at acute angles directing flows downstream and minimizing cross-current erosion of drainage banks.
- 4) A vegetative buffer “setback” from areas immediately outside of the project construction area shall be provided to minimize disturbance to existing drainage channel and stable soil/rock materials, protect the stream channel, and prohibit additional disturbance.
- 5) Silt fences shall be installed with stakes at a distance no more than six feet apart to ensure that the integrity of the fence is maintained. Environmental fencing and access control fencing around vegetative buffer areas shall be provided to ensure protection. Straw, jute netting and an appropriate revegetation method should be used at completion of grading activities to stabilize soils.
- 6) Topsoil that is removed from disturbed areas shall be stockpiled and covered for finish grading and revegetation after construction activities are completed. Topsoil should be reapplied except on slopes greater than 30 percent. Stockpiled topsoil shall not be compacted and shall be protected from loss with perimeter silt fencing and covering.

B) Roadways

- 1) Cut slopes shall be as steep as practical for site- specific soil conditions. Where practical, surface flow above cuts shall be intercepted by swales, temporary berms, or drainage systems to minimize flow down cut slope faces, unnecessary erosion, and slope failures.
- 2) When possible, fill slopes shall be track-walked with a crawler tractor or other method to compact the fill and minimize its erosion potential.
- 3) Cut and fill slopes shall be initially planted with perennial native grasses at 40 pounds per acre and covered with sterile straw mulch to meet short-term erosion control needs.

Long term planting shall be consistent with the Revegetation Plan and include native grasses. Woven jute or excelsior matting should be employed on steeper slopes to provide immediate stabilization.

- 4) Roadway construction at the new drainage crossings location shall be preceded with culvert placement. Disturbance at the crossing should then be minimized.

C) Dust Control

- 1) Water trucks and/or temporary sprinkler systems shall be used to prevent dust from blowing from the site or onto adjacent native vegetation.
- 2) Water trucks shall sprinkle all access roadways on a frequency necessary to preclude dust formation and transport. Air temperature, wind, and relative humidity shall be considered in determining the frequency of on-site and access road dust control watering.
- 3) Provision of soil binders, watering, and revegetation of disturbed areas shall proceed as quickly as possible after disturbance.

Monitoring Action 8 – Prior to bidding for construction

- A) Final design of erosion control features shall be reviewed by an Erosion Control Specialist prior to bidding for construction. During construction, a designated Coastal Conservancy representative shall be charged with observing and enforcing the erosion control requirements imposed on the contractors. After construction of improvements, a Coastal Conservancy representative shall designate an individual to be responsible for ongoing inspection of drainage and erosion control facilities and their scheduled maintenance.

- B) Training of the responsible individuals and contractors shall be a prerequisite to development construction within the Victorine Ranch project area. Heavy equipment operators, superintendents, and the designated inspector may receive special training by Erosion Control Specialists or through such specialty organizations as the Soil and Water Conservation Society and the International Erosion Control Association. A minimum one-day training program shall be a prerequisite for all contractors and heavy equipment operators engaged on the project. Training of personnel shall include ongoing maintenance activities for revegetated areas, silt and debris basins, culverts, energy dissipaters, and other permanent features.

C) Maintenance

1. Maintenance inspections of BMP features during construction shall be conducted daily to ensure adequacy of control measures. Silt fencing, diversion ditches and temporary detention facilities shall be visually inspected at the end of each work day and following any significant rainfall event to identify and repair points of failure or poor performance.
2. Routine maintenance of permanent erosion control facilities shall be maintained for at least one winter until permanent protection is established. All graded areas shall be inspected routinely throughout the rainy season to verify reestablishment of vegetation. Other inspections shall include:
 - a) Inspection of culvert entrances, trash racks and removal of debris that may block flow.
 - b) Inspection and repair of berms, silt fences, straw wattles and other control measures. Inspection shall ensure that the integrity of the erosion control measure is maintained and that flow is not bypassing the control measure through gaps or low points where material may have eroded, compacted, or collapsed.
 - c) Inspection and repair of energy dissipaters, outlet rip-rap protection and surface stabilization matting within drainage swale.

- d) Riparian areas shall be inspected for sediment loss, accumulation of brush, snags, and large woody debris. Such inspections shall be directed towards determination as to the stability of the debris and its contribution to erosion potential within the seasonal stream channel. In most instances stable debris, about which the stream channel has reached equilibrium, will not detrimentally increase erosion and sedimentation; however, its removal may. Should newly deposited debris serve to dramatically alter flow paths and potential points of erosion, then its removal may be warranted. If new gullies are developing in drainage areas, additional sterile straw mulch shall be applied and tuckered into the soil to increase erosion protection. Inspection of the area shall be conducted and if necessary, additional diversion ditches and protective measures should be applied.

D) Emergency Response

The Coastal Conservancy shall designate an individual to inspect the road for erosion damage and be responsible for ongoing maintenance activities and emergency response for at least one winter following the construction. An emergency erosion control response plan shall be developed to include:

1. A listing of responsible parties and contact persons including owner's personnel, contractor's personnel and regulatory agency staff who would be contacted in the case of an emergency flood, slope failure, and related failure of erosion controls.
2. A stockpile of emergency erosion control materials such as silt fencing, matting, and straw mulch shall be kept on-site for emergency use, if needed.

Mitigation Measure 9 – In order to ensure the design of permanent drainage and erosion control features incorporate Best Management Practice's (BMP's) and meet long-term erosion control objectives for the project, Design Guidelines shall be implemented.

A) Grading and drainage activities shall be designed to work with the prevailing topography to minimize total disturbance. Where drainage facilities are required, they shall be designed to safely pass anticipated flows yet minimize scour and deposition through erosion controls.

- 1) A sound roadway design shall be implemented to minimize roadway cut and fill prisms while achieving an earthwork balance to the greatest extent practical. Spoils disposal shall be in areas not subject to erosion.
- 2) Increased roadway drainage shall be controlled through the use of vegetative swales, berms, check dam facilities, silt traps, and maintaining the culvert installation for control of flows and their related erosion/scour energy. Roadways shall be graded to "dip" at the culvert crossing so that flows are not redirected and damaging if the culvert becomes blocked.

B) Revegetation

- 1) The specific elements of the replanting and revegetation measures as described in the Biological Resources Section above, include specific methods for replanting graded areas, slopes, riparian and potential wetland areas that are disturbed. In addition, success criteria, a five-year monitoring plan, adaptive management options if the success criteria are not met, and a long-term funding mechanism are specified. Upon implementing these measures, it is expected that the project site will support the same or more riparian habitat after construction than it currently does. This is due to the design configuration of the road improvement, allowing inundation of the area behind (up stream) of the new road alignment.

- 2) According to the erosion control and revegetation seed mixes, native species shall be used to meet the immediate vegetative establishment and long-term revegetation objectives, as well as replace habitat for important wildlife species (i.e. Smiths blue butterfly).
- 3) Combined use of hydro mulch, soil stabilizers, erosion control matting, and other products and materials shall be used for immediate slope stabilization pending seed germination and vegetation establishment. Control matting, and/or other products shall be required in the disturbed swale and channel if vegetation is not established at the onset of the rainy season, where potential flow velocities may be higher.
- 4) Permanent vegetative buffers shall be provided in downslope areas.

Monitoring Action 9 – Prior to bidding for construction

A) Refer to Monitoring Action 8.

7. HAZARDS AND HAZARDOUS MATERIALS	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
Would the project:				
a) Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through the routine transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials? (Sources: 1, 2, 3, 4)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
b) Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through reasonably foreseeable upset and accident conditions involving the release of hazardous materials into the environment? (Sources: 1, 2, 3, 4)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
c) Emit hazardous emissions or handle hazardous or acutely hazardous materials, substances, or waste within one-quarter mile of an existing or proposed school? (Sources: 1, 2, 3, 4)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
d) Be located on a site which is included on a list of hazardous materials sites compiled pursuant to Government Code Section 65962.5 and, as a result, would it create a significant hazard to the public or the environment? (Source: 1, 2, 3, 4)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
e) For a project located within an airport land use plan or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within two miles of a public airport or public use airport, would the project result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area? (Source: 1, 2, 3, 4)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
f) For a project within the vicinity of a private airstrip, would the project result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area? (Sources: 1, 2, 3, 4)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

7. HAZARDS AND HAZARDOUS MATERIALS				
Would the project:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
g) Impair implementation of or physically interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan? (Source: 1, 2, 3, 4)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
h) Expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving wildland fires, including where wildlands are adjacent to urbanized areas or where residences are intermixed with wildlands? (Source: 1, 2, 3, 4, 13)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

Discussion/Conclusion:

See previous Sections II. A (*Project Description*) and B (*Environmental Setting*) and Section IV. A (*Environmental Factors Potentially Affected*), as well as sources referenced.

8. HYDROLOGY AND WATER QUALITY				
Would the project:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
a) Violate any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements? (Sources: 1, 2, 3, 4)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
b) Substantially deplete groundwater supplies or interfere substantially with groundwater recharge such that there would be a net deficit in aquifer volume or a lowering of the local groundwater table level (e.g., the production rate of pre-existing nearby wells would drop to a level which would not support existing land uses or planned uses for which permits have been granted)? (Sources: 1, 2, 3, 4)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
c) Substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river, in a manner which would result in <u>substantial erosion or siltation on- or off-site</u> ? (Sources: 1, 2, 3, 4, 7, 9, 10)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
d) Substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river, or substantially increase the rate or amount of surface runoff in a manner which would result in <u>flooding on- or off-site</u> ? (Sources: 1, 2, 3, 4)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

8. HYDROLOGY AND WATER QUALITY

Would the project:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
e) Create or contribute runoff water which would exceed the capacity of existing or planned stormwater drainage systems or provide substantial additional sources of polluted runoff? (Sources: 1, 2, 3, 4)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
f) Otherwise substantially degrade water quality? (Sources: 1, 2, 3, 4)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
g) Place housing within a 100-year flood hazard area as mapped on a federal Flood Hazard Boundary or Flood Insurance Rate Map or other flood hazard delineation map? (Sources: 1, 2, 3, 4)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
h) Place within a 100-year flood hazard area structures which would impede or redirect flood flows? (Sources: 1, 2, 3, 4)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
i) Expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving flooding, including flooding as a result of the failure of a levee or dam? (Sources: 1, 2, 3, 4)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
j) Inundation by seiche, tsunami, or mudflow? (Sources: 1, 2, 3, 4)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Discussion:Hydrology

Drainage conditions will be improved by the proposed project through the implementation of Best Management Practices (BMPs), such that substantial erosion or siltation on- or off-site will be reduced compared to existing conditions. During construction, potential erosion or siltation is not anticipated. Neither will flooding (on- or off-site) result from the proposed project, since the topography in the area is generally fairly steep and therefore not conducive to flooding. No levees or dams are located in the area. Since the project is located near the coast, it would be at risk from a major tsunami generated by an extreme seismic event, the likelihood of which is so low as to be considered a less-than-significant impact.

Water Quality

Based on the project description, the road will remain pervious and the proposed project would not violate water quality standards or discharge requirements. Furthermore, groundwater supplies or recharge would not be effected. Therefore, water quality impacts are not anticipated.

Erosion Control

Specific erosion control measures during construction are required above by Mitigation Measures 7, 8, and 9, and under the Biological Resources Section.

Conclusion:

The project will not generate significant hydrologic or water-quality impacts or impacts that would require mitigations in order to be lessened to less-than-significant levels. Implementation of BMPs and the required Mitigation Measures 7, 8, and 9 and under the Biological Resources Section, provide the necessary mitigation and monitoring for this project; therefore, no additional mitigation measures are required.

9. LAND USE AND PLANNING		Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
Would the project:					
a)	Physically divide an established community? (Sources: 1, 2, 3, 7, 8)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
b)	Conflict with any applicable land use plan, policy, or regulation of an agency with jurisdiction over the project (including, but not limited to the general plan, specific plan, local coastal program, or zoning ordinance) adopted for the purpose of avoiding or mitigating an environmental effect? (Sources: 1, 2, 3, 4)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
c)	Conflict with any applicable habitat conservation plan or natural community conservation plan? (Source: 1, 2, 3, 4)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

Discussion:

See previous Sections II. A (*Project Description*) and B (*Environmental Setting*) and Section IV. A (*Environmental Factors Potentially Affected*), as well as sources referenced.

10. MINERAL RESOURCES		Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
Would the project:					
a)	Result in the loss of availability of a known mineral resource that would be of value to the region and the residents of the state? (Sources: 1, 2, 3, 4)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
b)	Result in the loss of availability of a locally important mineral resource recovery site delineated on a local general plan, specific plan or other land use plan? (Source: 1, 2, 3, 4)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

Discussion/Conclusion:

See previous Sections II. A (*Project Description*) and B (*Environmental Setting*) and Section IV. A (*Environmental Factors Potentially Affected*), as well as sources referenced.

11. NOISE	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
Would the project result in:				
a) Exposure of persons to or generation of noise levels in excess of standards established in the local general plan or noise ordinance, or applicable standards of other agencies? (Sources: 1, 2, 3, 4)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
b) Exposure of persons to or generation of excessive groundborne vibration or groundborne noise levels? (Sources: 1, 2, 3, 4)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
c) A substantial permanent increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project? (Sources: 1, 2, 3, 4)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
d) A substantial temporary or periodic increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project? (Sources: 1, 2, 3, 4)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
e) For a project located within an airport land use plan or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within two miles of a public airport or public use airport, would the project expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels? (Sources: 1, 2)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
f) For a project within the vicinity of a private airstrip, would the project expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels? (Sources: 1, 2)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

Discussion/Conclusion:

There are no significant generators of ground-borne vibration or ground-borne noise associated with the project and this issue is not evaluated further. This project is not located within an airport land use plan or in the vicinity of a public use airport. This project is not located within the vicinity of a private air strip.

Construction noise represents a short-term impact on ambient noise levels. Noise generated by construction equipment, including earth movers, material handlers, and heavy trucks can reach relatively high levels (refer to Table 4). According to the EPA, the equipment types operating at construction sites similar to the proposed project would not create substantial noise levels during daytime hours, particularly if the noise source is operated intermittently.

Table 4 Typical Noise Levels for Construction Equipment (at 50')	
Equipment	Noise Level (dBA)
Earth Moving: Compacter (Roller)	70-90
Front Loader	70-100
Backhoe	70-95
Bulldozer	75-95
Scraper, Grader	75-90
Paver	80-95
Truck	70-100
Materials Handling: Concrete Mixer	70-90
Concrete Pump	75-85
Crane (Movable)	75-100
Stationary: Pump	70-80
Generator	70-80
Compressor	70-90
Impact Equipment: Pneumatic Wrench	80-90
Jackhammer & Rock Drill	80-100
Pile Driver (Peak)	90-105
Others: Hand-held Compactor	70-80
Saws	70-90

Construction noise is assessed against the potential to create indoor or outdoor activity interference. Since outdoor conversation is interfered by noise levels that exceed an average of 60 dBA, this would be considered the threshold for impacts for activities, which take place over a relatively long period of time, i.e., continuously for several months. Existing residences are located within 200 feet of the project area and would be exposed to short-term noise impacts during construction. This is considered a potentially significant impact that can be reduced to a less-than-significant level with the following mitigation:

Mitigation Measure 10 – *In order to minimize construction noise nuisance impacts, the contractor and project engineer shall:*

- A) Choose construction equipment that is of quiet design, has a high-quality muffler system, and is well maintained, including trucks used to haul materials.
- B) Install superior intake and exhaust mufflers and engine enclosure panels wherever possible on gas, diesel or pneumatic impact machines. Stationary noise sources shall be located at least 300 feet from occupied dwelling units unless noise reducing engine housing enclosures or noise screens are provided by the contractor.
- C) Restrict hours for use of construction equipment, such as 8 am to 6 pm, Monday through Friday.
- D) Eliminate unnecessary idling of machines when not in use.
- E) Equipment mobilization areas, water tanks, and equipment storage areas shall be placed in a central location as far from existing residences as feasible.

Monitoring Action 10 – *To minimize construction noise nuisance impacts*

- A) During construction, the contractor shall implement and the applicant shall monitor the above mitigation measures.

12. POPULATION AND HOUSING		Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
Would the project:					
a)	Induce substantial population growth in an area, either directly (for example, by proposing new homes and businesses) or indirectly (for example, through extension of roads or other infrastructure)? (Sources: 1, 2, 3, 4)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b)	Displace substantial numbers of existing housing, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere? (Sources: 1, 2, 3, 4)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
c)	Displace substantial numbers of people, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere? (Source: 1, 2, 3, 4)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

Discussion/Conclusion:

There are no significant impacts to population and housing associated with this project. Conditions prior to the 1997-98 storm events allowed access to the Craven-Nation property for maintenance and to allow for potential future residential development. Post-project conditions will allow the continued use of the road, once repaired, for the same uses and potential future uses. However, no population growth is induced by the project and no future extension or expansion of the road beyond the road repair is proposed. Therefore, impacts would be less than significant because the road repair project would restore access to pre-existing conditions. Refer to Section VII.

In its current configuration, the road accesses two existing lots on the Craven-Nation property which could reasonably be developed with 2 single family homes, although this is not proposed as part of this project. The 1995 Initial Study adopted by the State Coastal Conservancy evaluated an additional 2 homes on the property, but only if the future property owner were to acquire 2 TDCs and obtain County approval for a minor subdivision of the property. The terms of the Conservancy's existing subscription agreement with the Victorine Ranch Mutual Water Company limits water service to the Craven-Nation property to a maximum of four residences. Further, any development of the property would be subject to environmental assessment in accordance with CEQA as well as permitting and approvals from the County of Monterey and must therefore be in compliance with all of the applicable goals and policies outlined in the County of Monterey General Plan. Additionally, because the Craven-Nation property is located at the end of the private Victorine Ranch Road on the North, and adjacent to Garrapata State Park on the South, there is no potential that the project will induce population growth.

As discussed in Section VII and the Conservancy's certified May 1995 Victorine Ranch Subdivision Initial Study and Negative Declaration (Appendix H), there is no evidence that this road repair project or even the future possible development described above would have significant environmental impacts. Future development of the Craven-Nation property would be restricted under provisions of conservation easements to be retained by the Coastal Conservancy upon sale of the property, per the Disposition Plan (Appendix J), thereby reducing any potential impacts of growth inducement to less than significant. The proposed easements would specifically prohibit all development on those portions of the property located in the Big Sur "Critical Viewshed" and in Environmentally Sensitive Habitat Areas (ESHA), notwithstanding any future changes in Monterey County's land use regulations that might otherwise permit such development.

The road repair project is not residential in nature and will not substantially induce growth or displace housing or people. There is no potential to induce growth beyond the Conservancy property. Therefore, this is considered a less-than-significant impact and no mitigation is required.

13. PUBLIC SERVICES		Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
Would the project result in:					
Substantial adverse physical impacts associated with the provision of new or physically altered governmental facilities, need for new or physically altered governmental facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental impacts, in order to maintain acceptable service ratios, response times or other performance objectives for any of the public services:					
a)	Fire protection? (Sources: 1, 2, 3, 4)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
b)	Police protection? (Sources: 1, 2, 3, 4)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
c)	Schools? (Sources: 1, 2, 3, 4)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
d)	Parks? (Sources: 1, 2, 3, 4)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
e)	Other public facilities? (Sources: 1, 2, 3, 4)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

Discussion/Conclusion:

See previous Sections II. A (*Project Description*) and B (*Environmental Setting*) and Section IV. A (*Environmental Factors Potentially Affected*), as well as sources referenced.

14. RECREATION				
Would the project:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
a) Increase the use of existing neighborhood and regional parks or other recreational facilities such that substantial physical deterioration of the facility would occur or be accelerated? (Sources: 1, 2, 3, 4)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
b) Does the project include recreational facilities or require the construction or expansion of recreational facilities which might have an adverse physical effect on the environment? (Sources: 1, 2, 3, 4)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

Discussion/Conclusion:

See previous Sections II. A (*Project Description*) and B (*Environmental Setting*) and Section IV. A (*Environmental Factors Potentially Affected*), as well as sources referenced.

15. TRANSPORTATION/TRAFFIC				
Would the project:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
a) Cause an increase in traffic which is substantial in relation to the existing traffic load and capacity of the street system (i.e., result in a substantial increase in either the number of vehicle trips, the volume to capacity ratio on roads, or congestion at intersections)? (Sources: 1, 2, 3, 4)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
b) Exceed, either individually or cumulatively, a level of service standard established by the county congestion management agency for designated roads or highways? (Sources: 1, 2, 3, 4)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
c) Result in a change in air traffic patterns, including either an increase in traffic levels or a change in location that results in substantial safety risks? (Sources: 1, 2, 3, 4)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
d) Substantially increase hazards due to a design feature (e.g., sharp curves or dangerous intersections) or incompatible uses (e.g., farm equipment)? (Sources: 1, 2, 3, 4)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
e) Result in inadequate emergency access? (Sources: 1, 2, 3, 4)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
f) Result in inadequate parking capacity? (Sources: 1, 2, 3, 4)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

15. TRANSPORTATION/TRAFFIC		Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
Would the project:					
g) Conflict with adopted policies, plans, or programs supporting alternative transportation (e.g., bus turnouts, bicycle racks)? (Sources: 1, 2, 3, 4)		<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

Discussion/Conclusion:

See previous Sections II. A (*Project Description*) and B (*Environmental Setting*) and Section IV. A (*Environmental Factors Potentially Affected*), as well as sources referenced.

16. UTILITIES AND SERVICE SYSTEMS		Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
Would the project:					
a) Exceed wastewater treatment requirements of the applicable Regional Water Quality Control Board? (Sources: 1, 9, 17, 24)		<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
b) Require or result in the construction of new water or wastewater treatment facilities or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental effects? (Sources: 1, 2, 3, 9, 11, 15, 17, 24)		<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
c) Require or result in the construction of new storm water drainage facilities or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental effects? (Sources: 1, 2, 3, 9, 11, 15, 17, 24)		<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
d) Have sufficient water supplies available to serve the project from existing entitlements and resources, or are new or expanded entitlements needed? (Sources: 1, 9, 16, 24)		<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
e) Result in a determination by the wastewater treatment provider which serves or may serve the project that it does not have adequate capacity to serve the project's projected demand in addition to the provider's existing commitments? (Sources: 1, 9, 17, 24)		<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
f) Be served by a landfill with sufficient permitted capacity to accommodate the project's solid waste disposal needs? (Sources: 1, 2, 9, 24)		<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

16. UTILITIES AND SERVICE SYSTEMS		Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
Would the project:					
g) Comply with federal, state, and local statutes and regulations related to solid waste? (Sources: 1, 2, 9, 24)		<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

Discussion/Conclusion:

See previous Sections II. A (*Project Description*) and B (*Environmental Setting*) and Section IV. A (*Environmental Factors Potentially Affected*), as well as sources referenced.

VII. MANDATORY FINDINGS OF SIGNIFICANCE

NOTE: If there are significant environmental impacts which cannot be mitigated and no feasible project alternatives are available, then complete the mandatory findings of significance and attach to this initial study as an appendix. This is the first step for starting the environmental impact report (EIR) process.

Does the project:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
a) Have the potential to degrade the quality of the environment, substantially reduce the habitat of a fish or wildlife species, cause a fish or wildlife population to drop below self-sustaining levels, threaten to eliminate a plant or animal community, reduce the number or restrict the range of a rare or endangered plant or animal or eliminate important examples of the major periods of California history or prehistory? (Sources: 1-14)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b) Have impacts that are individually limited, but cumulatively considerable ("cumulatively considerable" means that the incremental effects of a project are considerable when viewed in connection with the effects of past projects, the effects of other current projects, and the effects of probable future projects)? (Sources: 1-14)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c) Have environmental effects which will cause substantial adverse effects on human beings, either directly or indirectly? (Sources: 1-14)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

Discussion/Conclusion:

This Initial Study found that the proposed project and associated activities will potentially impact the environment in the areas of biological resources, cultural resources, geology and soils, and noise; however these potential impacts will be reduced of a less-than-significant level with implementation of the mitigation measures included in this report. The California State Coastal Conservancy shall implement the mitigation measures contained herein and shall include them in the project plan. Therefore, the project would have a less-than-significant impact on the environment, the habitat of a fish and wildlife species or population, plant or animal communities, rare or endangered plants or animals, or important examples of the major periods of California history or prehistory.

Implementation of the proposed project would restore access to the State Coastal Conservancy's Victorine Ranch property, which could potentially eliminate an existing constraint to potential future development of the lots of record on the property. However, the development potential of the Craven-Nation property existed prior to the storm damage sustained to the access road in 1997 and 1998. Repair of the road would restore the road to pre-existing conditions and would not represent an increase in the development potential inherent in this property. Based on the

conclusions reached in the May 1995 Victorine Ranch Subdivision Initial Study and Negative Declaration regarding future development of the property under the assumption that the property is sold and developed, the environmental and cumulative impacts would remain less-than-significant (Appendix H). This May 1995 Initial Study prepared for the Victorine Ranch Subdivision project involved the subdivision of two parcels into four lots for the eventual development of single family homes. Such development would be consistent with existing residential development within the Victorine Ranch, where five homes have been recently developed on lots whose size ranges from 3 to 15 acres. The 1995 Initial Study and Negative Declaration concluded that the environmental impacts of a four-unit subdivision on the property are less-than-significant based upon the Archaeological, Geologic, and Biological technical reports prepared at that time and attached to this Initial Study and Mitigated Negative Declaration as Appendices C, F, and I.

Based on detailed analysis of the property's topography and a geological survey of the property, the western quarter of the Craven-Nation property was identified as a likely area where building sites could be located outside the critical viewshed sight lines and on slopes of less than 30 percent. Without building envelopes and structural footprints including exact dimensions, a detailed critical viewshed analysis using Monterey County's "County-Wide Staking and Flagging Criteria" could not be made. However, any future development on the property will be subject to review and permitting by the County of Monterey at which time a detailed critical viewshed analysis will have to be completed for the specific development proposal using the County's criteria.

The property as presently configured consists of only two residential lots; development to the extent analyzed in the 1995 Initial Study and Negative Declaration would require further subdivision of the property and analysis of the attendant environmental impacts. In order to develop more than one unit per lot, the potential future developer would need to purchase two Transfer of Development Credits (TDCs) and then obtain County approval for a subdivision of the property.

Pursuant to the Craven-Nation Parcel Disposition Plan adopted by the Conservancy on March 23, 2002 (Appendix J), the Conservancy would sell the property in its present configuration and retain easements for the State protecting the natural and scenic resources on the property and reserving a public trail easement across the property. Prior to sale, all sensitive natural resources on the property including ESHAs and riparian areas, will be identified and mapped. Upon sale, the Craven-Nation property will be subject to a natural resource conservation easement which would prohibit development within the mapped areas and would further prohibit any use of the property as a whole that would adversely affect threatened or endangered species or their habit; degrade soil or water quality; or adversely affect riparian habitat. Permitted uses within the defined natural resources areas would be limited to recreational or educational uses not requiring surface alteration or development and that do not adversely affect wildlife habitat areas; protecting or enhancing wildlife habitat or natural, scenic or open-space values. Activities outside the defined resource areas would be limited to residential development and activities ancillary to residential use of the property which would not adversely affect sensitive resources.

The Conservancy will also retain an easement upon sale of the property that would prohibit any development on the Craven-Nation property that would impair scenic resources of the property

as defined by the critical viewshed policies of the Monterey County LCP. Thus, while it is impossible to define and analyze the precise nature, extent and location of potential future development on the property, the easement to be retained by the State upon sale of the property will ensure that such development does not adversely impact existing habitat and wildlife areas or conflict with current viewshed policies of the County. These restrictions would remain on the property in perpetuity, thus adding a level of protection that is not dependent on regulation alone.

Therefore, both cumulative and indirect impacts of future development on the site are considered less-than-significant for this project based upon the previous documentation and conclusions for a larger potential development, the mitigation measures and environmental analysis that would be required under any future development and the fact that any development would be subject to the stringent regulations of the LCP as well as the easement restrictions discussed above. Any potential future development would be subject to further environmental review and mitigation.

The following discussion is limited to the potential impacts associated with the subdivision of two parcels and the potential future development of the property. The environmental factors herein would have a less-than-significant or no cumulative impact with implementation of the road repair based on Appendix H, the May 1995 Initial Study/Negative Declaration (1995 IS/ND) prepared for the Victorine Ranch Subdivision.

Aesthetics

A cumulatively considerable impact of the road rehabilitation project is the possible residential development on the Craven-Nation property subsequent to sale by the Conservancy to a private party. In 1994, Bestor Engineers generated a tentative map of appropriate building sites located outside of the critical viewshed sight lines from Highway One (Appendix H). Based on the tentative map and the conclusions reached in the May 1995 Victorine Ranch Subdivision Initial Study and Negative Declaration regarding future development of the property under the assumption that the property is sold and developed, the environmental and cumulative impacts would remain less-than-significant (Appendix H).

Any proposed residential development would be subject to compliance with the County's viewshed ordinance. In addition, the Conservancy will retain easements on the property upon sale that would, among other things, specifically prohibit all development on those portions of the property located in the Big Sur "Critical Viewshed," notwithstanding any future changes in Monterey County's land use regulations that might otherwise permit such development. The proposed critical viewshed easement is not location specific. Based on the Monterey County's land use regulations, the proposed easement would prohibit any development visible from Highway 1 or major public viewing areas, including turnouts, beaches and other specified locations.

As identified and evidenced in the findings of the 1995 IS/ND in Appendix H, the potential development would have a less-than-significant impact because any future building sites would be located outside of the critical viewshed sight lines. The conclusions in this document are consistent with that finding because circumstances have not changed. Potential future development would be subject to the current laws and regulations including, but not limited to the Big Sur Coast Land Use Plan, Monterey County Zoning Coastal Implementation Plan, Monterey County General Plan, and Monterey County permitting and approval guidelines.

Biological Resources

As identified and evidenced in the findings of the 1995 IS/ND in Appendix H, any reasonably foreseeable future development of the Craven-Nation property would have no impact because potentially affected species would be limited to chaparral, brush and grassland (Appendix I). The conclusions in this document are consistent with the finding of no impact because as stated above, the Conservancy would sell the property in its present configuration and retain easements for the State protecting the natural and scenic resources on the property and reserving a public trail easement across the property. Potential development would be prohibited within natural resource areas and permitted uses within those areas limited as previously defined above. Potential future development would be subject to the current laws and regulations including, but not limited to the Big Sur Coast Land Use Plan, Monterey County Zoning Coastal Implementation Plan, Monterey County General Plan, and Monterey County permitting and approval guidelines.

Cultural Resources

As identified and evidenced in the findings of the 1995 IS/ND in Appendix H, any reasonably foreseeable future development would have a less-than-significant impact because no record information or surface evidence of potentially significant cultural resources was found. Based on the 1988 study of the entire 100-acre Craven-Nation property (Appendix C), there is no evidence that potential development of the property would have a significant impact on cultural resources. The conclusions in this document are consistent with that finding because circumstances have not changed. Potential future development would be subject to the current laws and regulations including, but not limited to the Big Sur Coast Land Use Plan, Monterey County Zoning Coastal Implementation Plan, Monterey County General Plan, and Monterey County permitting and approval guidelines.

Geology/Soils

As identified and evidenced in the findings of the 1995 IS/ND in Appendix H, any reasonably foreseeable future development would have a less-than-significant impact because the potential development would be limited to areas with gradients below 30 percent. According to the Geological Feasibility Investigation (Appendix F, page 3), potential development of the two parcels proposed by the subdivision would be confined to the western quarter of the 100-acre Craven-Nation property. The western quarter of the property consists of gentle to moderate slopes with gradients ranging from about 10 to 20 percent. Findings located in Appendix H of this document state that subdivision and potential development of the two parcels would have a less-than-significant impact. The conclusions in this document are consistent with that finding because circumstances have not changed. Potential future development would be subject to the current laws and regulations including, but not limited to the Big Sur Coast Land Use Plan, Monterey County Zoning Coastal Implementation Plan, Monterey County General Plan, and Monterey County permitting and approval guidelines.

Insofar as future development of the Craven-Nation property may be a foreseeable future use of the property, such development will not expose persons or property to impacts from geological hazards or unstable soils. According to the discussion above and based on the geological investigation and soils suitability analysis conducted by Terratech, Inc., (Appendix F), the

potential placement of residential of homes and residential septic systems will not expose persons or property to impacts from geological hazards or unstable soils.

Hydrology/Water Quality

Potential future development could be located on a portion of the Craven-Nation property which contains feasible building sites. As identified and evidenced in the findings of the 1995 IS/ND in Appendix H, any reasonably foreseeable future development would have a less-than-significant impact because the increase of impervious surfaces would cover only a small portion of the total 100-acre Craven-Nation property. In addition, the culvert to be constructed will accommodate runoff from the limited future development reasonably foreseeable on the property. The conclusions in this document are consistent with the finding of less-than-significant impact due to the evidence cited above. Additionally, since all potential future development will be subject to the current laws and regulations including, but not limited to the Big Sur Coast Land Use Plan, Monterey County Zoning Coastal Implementation Plan, Monterey County General Plan, and Monterey County permitting and approval guidelines, as well as CEQA guidelines, any future impact can be reduced to less than significant.

Land Use/Planning

Potential residential development on the two existing lots of record could be located on the identified portion of the Craven-Nation property containing feasible building sites. The previous IS/ND analyzed the impacts of such a potential. As identified and evidenced in the findings of the previous IS/ND in Appendix H, the potential development would have a less-than-significant impact because it would not conflict with existing planned land use, which is Watershed and Scenic Conservation with a minimum lot of 40 acres. Potential future development must be in compliance with the Monterey Coastal Implementation Plan. Further, although the project may result in sale of the property, all future uses will be subject to public access and conservation easements to conserve and protect environmentally sensitive resource areas, particularly ESHA, as noted above. Preparation of the proposed conservation easement (by Conservancy staff in cooperation with staff of the California Coastal Commission) also involved a preliminary cultural resources reconnaissance. Conservation and protection of ESHA and the cultural reconnaissance both satisfy the policies under Natural Resources Goal 1, 7, 8, 11, and 12. The public access easement also satisfies the policies under Area Development Goal 26, 27, 34, 36, and 51. The floodplain boundaries have been delineated for the project and erosion control measures have been determined; therefore, the project is in compliance with the applicable policies outlined under Environmental Constraints.

The conclusions in this document are consistent with the finding of less-than-significant impact from the adopted Negative Declaration since all potential future development will be subject to the current laws and regulations including, but not limited to the Big Sur Coast Land Use Plan, Monterey County Zoning Coastal Implementation Plan, Monterey County General Plan, and Monterey County permitting and approval guidelines, as well as CEQA guidelines.

Population/Housing

In its current configuration, the road accesses two existing lots on the Craven-Nation property which could reasonably be developed with 2 single family homes, although this is not proposed as part of this project. The previous Initial Study adopted by the State Coastal Conservancy evaluated an additional 2 homes on the property, but only if the future property owner were to

acquire 2 TDCs and obtain County approval for a minor subdivision of the property. The terms of the Conservancy's existing subscription agreement with the Victorine Ranch Mutual Water Company limits water service to the Craven-nation property to a maximum of four residences. Further, any development of the property would be subject to environmental assessment in accordance with CEQA as well as permitting and approvals from the County of Monterey and must therefore be in compliance with all of the applicable goals and policies outlined in the County of Monterey General Plan. Additionally, because the Craven-Nation property is located at the end of the private Victorine Ranch Road on the North, and adjacent to Garrapata State Park on the South, there is no potential that the project will induce population growth.

Pursuant to the certified May 1995 Victorine Ranch Subdivision Initial Study and Negative Declaration (Appendix H), there is no evidence that this road repair project or even the future possible development described above would have significant environmental impacts. Future development of the Craven-Nation property would be restricted under conservation easements to be reserved by the Coastal Conservancy upon sale, per the Disposition Plan, thereby reducing any potential impacts of growth inducement to less than significant. The proposed easements would specifically prohibit all development on those portions of the property located in the Big Sur "Critical Viewshed" and in Environmentally Sensitive Habitat Areas (ESHA), notwithstanding any future changes in Monterey County's land use regulations that might otherwise permit such development.

As identified and evidenced in the findings of the 1995 IS/ND in Appendix H, the potential development would have no impact because it would be limited to that permitted under existing land use regulations. The project is located in an area that is zoned for low-density residential. The potential future development would not exceed regional population projections nor induce substantial growth, or displace existing housing. The conclusions in this document are consistent with that finding because circumstances have not changed. Potential future development would be subject to the current laws and regulations including, but not limited to the Big Sur Coast Land Use Plan, Monterey County Zoning Coastal Implementation Plan, Monterey County General Plan, and Monterey County permitting and approval guidelines.

Public Services and Utilities/Service Systems

Potential residential development on the two existing lots of record could be located on the identified portion of the Craven-Nation property containing feasible building sites. The previous IS/ND analyzed the impacts of such a potential scenario. As identified and evidenced in the findings of the 1995 IS/ND in Appendix H, any reasonably foreseeable future development would have a less-than-significant impact because a Subscription Agreement with the Victorine Ranch Mutual Water Company entitles the property to obtain up to four connections for residential water supply and additional public services would not be necessary. The conclusions in this document are consistent with that finding because circumstances have not changed and public services are available to serve the existing lots of record and future homes, should they be pursued. Potential future development would be subject to requirements for service extension and also subject to the provision of current laws and regulations surrounding such extension, including, but not limited to the Big Sur Coast Land Use Plan, Monterey County Zoning Coastal Implementation Plan, Monterey County General Plan, and Monterey County permitting and approval guidelines.

Recreation

As identified and evidenced in the findings of the 1995 IS/ND in Appendix H, any reasonably foreseeable future development would have no impact because it would not require the need to increase recreational facilities. Implementation of the road repair project will permit recreational uses within the defined natural resources areas. The conclusions in this document are consistent with that finding because circumstances have not changed and permitted recreational uses would not require surface alteration or development. Potential future development would be subject to the current laws and regulations including, but not limited to the Big Sur Coast Land Use Plan, Monterey County Zoning Coastal Implementation Plan, Monterey County General Plan, and Monterey County permitting and approval guidelines.

Transportation/Traffic

As identified and evidenced in the findings of the 1995 IS/ND in Appendix H, any reasonably foreseeable future development would have a less-than-significant impact because the development of two parcels would not generate substantial additional traffic. The conclusions in this document are consistent with that finding because circumstances have not changed. Potential future development would be subject to the current laws and regulations including, but not limited to the Big Sur Coast Land Use Plan, Monterey County Zoning Coastal Implementation Plan, Monterey County General Plan, and Monterey County permitting and approval guidelines.

Conclusion:

The proposed road rehabilitation would not, as demonstrated in this environmental document, significantly impact the resources of the project area. As evidenced by the preceding analysis in this IS, the road repair project would be mitigated to a less-than-significant level and would be reduced such that the impacts would not be cumulatively considerable. This determination is based on the temporary nature of the impacts, the inclusion of adequate mitigation in the project plans and an understanding of cumulative impacts of projects in the area in relation to the less-than-significant impacts of the proposed project. As evidenced by the preceding analysis in this IS, the previous IS/ND included in Exhibit H, as well as the entirety of the record and technical appendices referenced and included herein, the potential impacts of the possible development of the two parcels are less-than-significant or no impact. Additionally, pursuant to the Disposition Plan adopted by the Conservancy in connection with future sale of the property, the Coastal Conservancy will map and retain conservation easements over all environmentally sensitive habitat areas (ESHA), and will also establish and reserve trail easements to provide for public access.

The project was determined to not have any adverse effects on human beings directly or indirectly. The previous sections document the reasons for this determination.

VIII. REFERENCES

1. DD&A, *Victorine Ranch Road Repair Combined Development Permit Application*, July 2003
2. Bestor Engineers, *Tentative Map of Victorine Ranch*, 1994.
3. County of Monterey, *Monterey County Draft General Plan*, April 29, 2003
4. County of Monterey, *Big Sur Coast Land Use Plan*, January 6, 1996
5. County of Monterey, *Monterey County Coastal Implementation Plan, Part 3*, January 5, 1988
6. County of Monterey, Coastal Implementation Plan Title 20 Zoning Ordinance for the County of Monterey Part 1, February 2000
7. Monterey Bay Unified Air Pollution Control District, CEQA Air Quality Guidelines, Revised September 2002
8. DD&A, Biological Assessment for a Proposed Road Repair Project on the Old Victorine Ranch, July 9, 2003
9. Stephen R. Staub Forester and Environmental Consultant, Forester's Assessment and Recommendation on Proposed Access Road Rehabilitation Project, June 26, 2003
10. D&M Consulting Engineers, Inc., Geotechnical Report for Access Road Restoration Victorine Ranch, May 14, 2003
11. DD&A, Erosion Control Plan Victorine Ranch Road Repair, June 30, 2003
12. Archaeological Consulting, Preliminary Cultural Resources Reconnaissance of a Portion of the Victorine Ranch, Carmel Highlands, Monterey County, California, October 15, 1988
13. Archaeological Consulting, Letter addressed to DD&A dated January 24, 2003
14. County of Monterey, Geographical Information System, 21st Century General Plan Update, 2001.
15. State Coastal Conservancy, Victorine Ranch Subdivision Initial Study and Negative Declaration, May 4, 1995.
16. State Coastal Conservancy, Craven-Nation Property Disposition Plan, Resolution and Findings Adopted March 23, 2000.
17. State Coastal Conservancy, draft Natural Resource Conservation and Public Access Easement, October 7, 2003.

APPENDIX A
BIOLOGICAL ASSESSMENT

APPENDIX B
FOREST MANAGEMENT ASSESSMENT PLAN

APPENDIX C
CULTURAL RESOURCES RECONNAISSANCE

APPENDIX D

LETTER DATED JANUARY 24, 2003 FROM ARCHAEOLOGICAL CONSULTING

APPENDIX E
GEOLOGICAL AND GEOTECHNICAL REPORT

APPENDIX F
GEOLOGIC FEASIBILITY INVESTIGATION

APPENDIX G
EROSION CONTROL PLAN

APPENDIX H
VICTORINE RANCH SUBDIVISION
INITIAL STUDY AND NEGATIVE DECLARATION

APPENDIX I
BOTANICAL/BIOLOGICAL REPORT

APPENDIX J
PROPERTY DISPOSITION PLAN